REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-23 are pending in the application. By this Amendment claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11-18, and 21-22 are amended, and claim 7 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-9, 11-18, and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,002,184 to Lloyd (hereinafter "Lloyd"). Claim 7 has been canceled. The rejection is respectfully traversed in so far as it applies to the remaining claims.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that the impact dispersing mechanism comprises a first portion attached to the upper cover and a second portion attached to the lower cover and wherein a predetermined clearance is maintained between the first portion and the second portion prior to an impact being applied to the upper cover. Lloyd does not disclose or suggest at least such features, or the claimed combination of independent claim 1.

That is, the Examiner corresponds element number 18 (described by Lloyd as a cover) with the claimed upper cover and element 16 (described by Lloyd as a base) with the claimed lower cover. The Examiner then refers to col. 2, lines 18-27 of Lloyd with respect to the claimed impact dispersing mechanism. However, col. 2, lines 18-27 of Lloyd refer to the soft foam pad 26. The soft foam pad 26 does not include a second portion attached to the lower cover and a predetermined clearance is not maintained between the soft foam pad 26 and the cover 18 prior

to an impact being applied to the cover 18. That is, the soft foam 26 is attached to the cover 18 and protrudes therefrom. Further, as shown in Figure 3 of Lloyd, no clearance is provided between the soft pad 26 and the base 16. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines over Lloyd.

Independent claim 9 has been similarly amended to recite that the impact dispensing device comprises a first portion attached to the first cover and a second portion attached to the second cover and wherein a predetermined clearance is maintained between the first portion and the second portion prior to a force being applied to the first cover. Thus, claim 9 also defines over Lloyd.

Independent claim 18 recites, *inter alia*, a first gap of substantially constant height formed between a lower surface of the at least one first rib and an upper surface of the at least one second rib, wherein a second gap of substantially constant height is formed between an upper surface of the display and a lower surface of the first housing, and wherein the height of the second gap is greater than the height of the first gap when the first housing is attached to the second housing. Lloyd does not disclose or suggest at least such features, or the claimed combination of independent claim 18. That is, Lloyd does not disclose or suggest at least the claimed ribs or the claimed gaps. Accordingly, claim 18 also defines over Lloyd.

Thus, the rejection of independent claims 1, 9, and 18 over Lloyd should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 3-6, 8, 11-17, and 20-23 are allowable over Lloyd at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 9, and 18, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claims 2 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being patentable over Lloyd in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,699 to Murray et al. (hereinafter "Murray"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 2 and 10 are allowable over Lloyd at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 9, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features. Murray fails to overcome the deficiencies of Lloyd, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching a printed circuit board. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2 and 10 over Lloyd and Murray should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 19 is allowable over Lloyd at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 18, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 19 over Lloyd should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

Carol L. Druzbick
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 CLD/jlg/kah:knh
Date: NOVEMBER 16, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610